

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/005,783	LEWIS ET AL.	
	Examiner Daniel Pan	Art Unit 2183	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Daniel Pan. (3) _____.

(2) Christopher Rauch. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 03 February 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 20-25.

Identification of prior art discussed: Motoyama (5,535,318).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

DANIEL H. PAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2183
01/03
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner conveyed the office position to applicant. Examiner explained : any read/write instruction could serve as read and write identifier, the initializing execution is inherent in every system, the execution of debug command could be inherent in the initialization of a computer system. Examiner also explained the debug command in Motoyama (art of record) was used for purpose of dependency checking. Applicant agreed to cancel claims 20-25 by Examiner's Amendment, and reserved the rights to pursue these claims in continuation and counter argue the office position. Applicant did not agree the office position, but in order to let the other claims to proceed, claims 20-25 have been cancel without prejudice. Applicant disagreed the rejection 20-25 based on the reference and office position. Applicant also object the process by which the rejection to claims 20-25 after allowed. Because disagreeing with the rejection, applicant reserves the right to petition against the process by which the rejection being made. This action is sent as a Supplemental Allowance to the Notice of Allowance on 11/08/05 in order to cancel claims 20-25 .